

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 10 has been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

### Objection to Claim 10

Claim 10 is objected to because the term "ISN pin" is unclear. Applicant amends claim 10 to overcome this objection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6, 8, and 12 are rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,726,702 issued to Hamaguchi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hamaguchi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,592 issued to Chess et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Chess"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi and Chess, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1.

In item 3, the Office Action notes that Hamaguchi does not teach, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action asserts that col. 3, lines 25-28 of Chess teaches this claim element. Col. 3, lines 25-28 of Chess discloses, "If the special key combination is being pressed, the program loads the first sector from the diskette in the A:drive, using a minimal diskette-input routine built into the unalterable ROM,..."

Chess does not disclose outputting a key signal to a central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program. Col. 3, lines 25-28 does not refer to a central processing unit, a memory card or a main program. Col. 3, lines 25-28 does not refer to outputting a key signal to a central processing unit.

In addition, Hamaguchi is directed toward a television receiving apparatus. However, Chess refers to verifying the integrity of a computer systems BIOS program. Chess does not pertain to a television receiving apparatus.

Moreover, In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396, (U.S. Supreme Court 2007), the Supreme Court stated,

“Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the market place; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent issue. To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977,988 (CA Fed. 2006) (“[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”).”

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not articulate a reason for combining the references cited to reject the claims. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 2, 6, 8, and 12 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2, 6, 8, and 12 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,134,134 issued to Fries. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, and Fries, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory,” as recited in claim 1. Fries does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi and Chess. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 7 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claims 3-4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,685 issued to Jackson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, and Jackson, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. Jackson does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi and Chess. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 3 and 4 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess and Jackson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,150,013 issued to Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, Jackson, and Kim, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. Kim does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi, Chess, and Jackson. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 5 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess and Jackson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,597 issued to Oh et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Oh"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, Jackson, and Oh, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. Oh

does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi, Chess, and Jackson. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 9 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess, and further in view of Oh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, and Oh, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. Oh does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi and Chess. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 10 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamaguchi in view of Chess and Oh, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023544 issued to Yap et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Yap"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hamaguchi, Chess, Oh, and Yap, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a key input unit receiving a control command from a user and outputting a key signal to the central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program from the memory card to the memory," as recited in claim 1. Yap does not cure the deficiencies of Hamaguchi, Chess, and Oh. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105716 issued to Sutton, JR. et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Sutton"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yap and Sutton, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "determining whether the main program is downloaded by checking information of the file recorded in the header and a capacity of the main program recorded in the memory," as recited in claim 13. In item 10, the Office Action notes that Yap does not disclose this claim element. Therefore, the Office Action asserts that paragraph [0007] on page 1 of Sutton discloses this claim element.

Paragraph [0007] of Sutton discloses, "The content of the received file and the stored file may be verified, for example by using all or part of the file name, the hash of the file, the size of the file, content in all or part of the file, or other means." However, Sutton does disclose "a header."

In addition, Yap is directed toward a card reading device. However, Sutton refers to reducing duplication of files on a network by performing a comparison of digital signatures. Sutton does not pertain to a card reading device.

Moreover, In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396, (U.S. Supreme Court 2007), the Supreme Court stated,

"Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the market place; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent issue. To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977,988 (CA Fed. 2006) ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness")."

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not articulate a reason for combining the references cited to reject the claim. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 13 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap in view of Sutton, and further in view of Hamaguchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yap, Sutton, and Hamaguchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "determining whether the main program is downloaded by checking information of the file recorded in the header and a capacity of the main program recorded in the memory," as recited in claim 13. Hamaguchi does not cure the deficiencies of Yap and Sutton. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 13 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 15 and 18-19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 15 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap in view of Chess, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,072,950 issued to Toft, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art (figure 2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yap, Chess, Toft, and admitted prior art (figure 2) taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "receiving a memory card selection key signal to download a main program directly from the memory card through the memory card interface, wherein the memory card selection key signal is set by an input signal from the key input unit," as recited in claim 15.

On page 14, the Office Action asserts that col. 3, lines 25-28 of Chess teaches this claim element. Col. 3, lines 25-28 of Chess discloses, "If the special key combination is being pressed, the program loads the first sector from the diskette in the A:drive, using a minimal diskette-input routine built into the unalterable ROM,..."

Chess does not disclose outputting a key signal to a central processing unit to control the memory card to directly download the main program. Col. 3, lines 25-28 does not refer to a central processing unit, a memory card or a main program. Col. 3, lines 25-28 does not refer to outputting a key signal to a central processing unit.

Moreover, In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396, (U.S. Supreme Court 2007), the Supreme Court stated,

"Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the market place; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent issue. To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977,988 (CA Fed. 2006) ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be

sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”).”

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not articulate a reason for combining the four references cited to reject the claims. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 15 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 15 and include all of the features of claim 15. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 18 and 19 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claims 16-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap in view of Chess and U.S. Patent No. 7,072,950 issued to Toft, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,578 issued to Prus et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yap, Chess, Toft, and Prus, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “receiving a memory card selection key signal to download a main program directly from the memory card through the memory card interface, wherein the memory card selection key signal is set by an input signal from the key input unit,” as recited in claim 15. Prus does not cure the deficiencies of Yap, Chess, and Toft. In addition, Prus does not cure the deficiencies of the admitted prior art (figure 2). Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 15 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and include all of the features of claim 15. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 16 and 17 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Summary

Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/627,726

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 11, 2008

By: 

Paul F. Daebeler

Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501